



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

09/216,214    12/18/98    HAVEMANN    R    TI-21570

JACQUELINE J GARNER  
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS  
P O BOX 655474 M S 3999  
DALLAS TX 75265

MM22/0216

EXAMINER

TRAN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED:

02/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Advisory Action

Application No.

09/216,214

Applicant(s)

Havemann

Examiner

Thien Tran

Group Art Unit

2811



## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Feb 4, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The proposed new limitations in claims 8 and 9 require further consideration and/or search.

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
see attachment

☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 8 and 9

☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Other

SYSTEMATIC  
PRIMARY REVISION  
CIRCULAR

*Steven Loh*

Art Unit: 2811

*Response to Arguments*

Applicant's amendment stated that final rejection is improper on the second office action because the amendment to the claims 8 and 9 did not raise new issues and/or require a new search. The Examiner is respectfully disagreed with Applicant's remarks. For claims 3 and 6 are non-elected claims, therefore, the limitations in these claims are not considered by the examiner. The original claims 8 and 9 were improperly depended on these non-elected claims 3 and 6. As a result, claims 8 and 9 were incomplete and defective for lacking limitations in the claim body. Applicant amended claims 8 and 9 in amendment Paper No. 7, deleting and inserting new limitations into the body of the claims to make the claims independent from the non-elected claims 3 and 6, and to overcome the 112, second paragraph rejection for being incomplete and defective. The new limitations in claims 8 and 9 clearly raised new issue and Applicant's action, therefore, necessitates the new ground of rejection and make the second office action final and proper as stated in MPEP 706.07(a).